

No. 9/5/84-61ab/6708:- In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Eicher Goodearth Ltd., N.I.T., Faridabad :-

BEFORE SHRI R.N. BATRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 111/1983

between :-

SHRI SATISH CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S EICHER GOODEARTH  
LTD., N.I.T., FARIDABAD

Present :- Shri Darshan Singh for the workman.

Shri R.C. Sharma for the Management

#### AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following Dispute between the workman Shri Satish Chand and the Management of M/s Eicher Goodearth Ltd., N.I.T., Faridabad, to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

1. Whether the termination of service of Shri Satish Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. It may be mentioned that the notices were issued to both the parties. The claimant in his claim statement, dated 8th April, 1983 alleged that he was working as a permanent workman at Rs. 340 per month with effect from 1st March, 1981 and that his services were terminated on 1st December, 1982 without any charge-sheet etc. and that no payment was made to him under the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It was alleged that the termination was illegal and unjustified and as such, the claimant was entitled to reinstatement with full back wages.

3. The respondent company in their written statement, dated 8th April, 1983 pleaded that the claimant was working as a casual workman and he worked for 210 days only during the years 1981 and 1982 and as such, the Management was within its right to terminate his service who has no lien on the post.

4. The workman in his rejoinder, dated the 15th May, 1984, reiterated the pleas taken in the claim statement.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issue was framed on 15th May, 1984:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Satish Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

6. It may be mentioned that both the parties led evidence. After going through the same and hearing their representatives, my findings on the above issue is as under:—

#### Issue No. II.—

7. The Management has examined Shri Nihal Pal Singh (MW-1) who stated that whenever the work load justified, they used to employ the casual workers to cope with the increased work. He further stated that casual workers were paid on daily rate system and that the claimant was the casual worker in their factory. He also stated that he has prepared the chart Ex.M-1 regarding the wages paid to the claimant in which full details of attendance had been given and that Ex. M-2 was the report regarding the conciliation proceedings.

8. The workman Shri Satish Chand had appeared as WW-1 and stated that he was employed in the factory as helper in Tractor Assembly Department. He then stated that he was not allowed to join duty in December, 1982 and no letter was given to him while terminating his service nor any charge-sheet was issued. He further stated that no compensation etc. was paid to him and that he worked in the factory continuously. He further stated that some new person had been employed by the management in his place and that he was unemployed even now.

9. The case of the Management is that the claimant was a casual worker and he had worked for 210½ days during the period 1st March, 1981 to 1st December, 1982 and as such, he was not entitled to compensation etc. and that the Management was within its right to terminate his service. The ruling reported as *Lalappa Lingappa and others and Laxmi Vishnu Textile Mills, Solapur*, 1981-I-LLJ-page 308, has been relied upon in which it is laid down that the permanent employees were not entitled to payment of gratuity for the years they remained absent without leave and had actually worked for less than 240 days in a year. The ruling is based on the provisions of Section 25-C of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the explanation of which deals with a badli workman. It may be mentioned at this stage that it is not the case of any party in the pleadings that the claimant was a badli workman. As such, the provisions of Section 25-C of the Industrial Disputes Act, are of no help to the Management. Further the claimant has not alleged that he was entitled to payment of gratuity but, on the other hand, he as deposed that he was entitled to compensation etc. under the provisions of Section 25-E of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The ruling reported as 1981-I-LLJ-page 308 (*Supra*) deals with the Payment of Gratuity and is thus of no help to the Management. The testimony of the workman is that he worked continuously with the respondent factory whereas the case of the management is that he worked for less than 240 days. Ex. M-1 is the chart in which the details of attendance of the claimant have been given. In the ruling reported *The Kapurthala Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Kapurthala vs. The Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Jullundur and others*, 1984 Lab. I.C. page 974, it has been held by the Hon'able Punjab and Haryana High Court that where the services of the workmen were terminated on their rendering 230 days service with notional breaks when the work of the workmen was satisfactory and others had been recruited in their place, it was instance of unfair labour practice and when the workman were entitled to reinstatement the logical consequence was that they should get their full back wages. In the chart Ex. M-1, the services rendered by the claimant has been shown with notional breaks for example 2.3.1981 to 3.3.81, 9.3.81 to 13.3.1981, 14.3.81 to 16.3.1981 to 19.3.1981, 23.3.1981 to 26.3.1981, 30.3.1981 to 31.3.1981, 2.4.1981 to 4.4.1981 and so on. Following the above ruling of the Hon'able Punjab and Haryana High Court which fully applies to the facts of the present case, it is held that the termination of the service of the claimant by the management was illegal because on the basis of the notional breaks in service, the period was shown less than 240 days. In that ruling, the workmen were held entitled to reinstatement because the practice of retrenching the workman by showing notional breaks was not upheld. Consequently the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 apply to the case of the applicant. Since this provision has not been complied with such, therefore, the termination of service of the claimant was neither justified nor in order and as such, the claimant is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages. The award is passed accordingly.

R. N. BATRA.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Dated the 14th September, 1984.

Endst. No. 949, dated the 14th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 for the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA.

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 11th October, 1984

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/6844.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s P.D. Engineering Works, Near Press Colony, N.I.T., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI R.N. BARTA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 362/1982

Between

SHRI UMA DUTT SHARMA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S P.D. ENGINEERING  
WORKS, NEAR PRESS COLONY, N.I.T., FARIDABAD.

Present — Shri R.P. Singh for the workman,  
Shri R.C. Sharma for the Management.

## AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by clause of (d) of sub-section (1) of Section-10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 the Governor of Haryana referred to following dispute between Shri Uma Dutta Sharma, Workman and the Management of M/s P.D. Engineering Works, Near Press Colony, N.I.T Faridabad, to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

- (1) Whether the termination of service of Shri Uma Dutta Sharma, was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. Notices were issued to both the parties. The demand notice dated 15th June, 1982 was treated as claim statement on the request of the workman. It was alleged that the claimant was appointed as Shaperman on 1st November, 1978, in the respondent factory at Rs. 475 per month and was promoted as Die-Fitter in 1979 at Rs. 740 per month. It was then alleged that on 2th April, 1982, the workman decided to raise a general demand through the union and that four workmen were authorised to sign the general demand notice including the claimant. It was further alleged that on 14th April, 1982, a chargesheet dated 8th April, 1982 containing the false allegations was served on the claimant who was suspended on 17th April, 1982. It was alleged that no proper opportunity was given to the claimant to defend himself in the domestic enquiry and that a complaint was filed in that respect. It was then alleged that the Management had acted in a revengeful manner and had terminated the service of the claimant illegally, due to which he was entitled to be reinstated with full back wages.

3. The respondent factory in its written statement dated 17th November, 1982 pleaded that the claimant was chargesheeted on 14th April, 1982 because on 8th April, 1982 he left the factory without any intimation after working half an hour after lunch time and that on 9th April 1982, when he came for duty, he was enquired about his behaviour dated 8th April, 1982 when he misbehaved and abused the officers of the factory. It was further pleaded that the enquiry officer held the enquiry in which the claimant was represented by his representative Shri Ram Avtar and was given full opportunity to cross examine the witnesses of the Management. The Enquiry Officer found that the charges against the claimant were correct and that a show cause notice was issued to the claimant as to why the punishment of dismissal may not be awarded to him that after considering the entire matter, the claimant was dismissed from service. It was further pleaded that the enquiry was held according to the principles of natural justice and that the punishment was quite in proportionate to the gravity of the misconduct. It was denied that the Management acted in a revengeful manner. It was then pleaded that the enquiry was fair and proper and in case the enquiry was found to be vitiated, the Management was entitled to produce their evidence and reserved their right to adduce evidence in support of the charges.

4. The claimant in his rejoinder dated 29th December, 1982 reiterated the pleas taken in the demand notice and denied that the enquiry was fair and proper.

5. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed:—

- (1) Whether the enquiry is fair and proper ? (O.P.M.)  
(2) Whether the termination of service of Shri Uma Dutt Sharma was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

6. Issue No. 1 was treated as preliminary issue. The Management has examined two witnesses and documents Ex. M-1 to M-20 have been tendered into evidence. The workman appeared as WW-1 and documents Ex. W-1 to W-7, have been tendered into evidence. After going through the evidence and hearing both the sides, my findings on the above issues are as under:—

## Issue No. 1.

7. The Management examined Shri Satish Kumar Ahuja as MW-1 who stated that he was appointed as Enquiry Officer by the Management,—vide letter Ex. M-1 and that Ex. M-2 was the chargesheet. He further stated that notice Ex. M-3 was sent by him and that Ex. M-4 were the proceedings held by him in the presence of the claimant and his representative. He also stated that the claimant was given full opportunity to cross examine the witnesses produced by the Management. He then stated that the claimant was given full opportunity to produce defence evidence but no witness was produced by him. He then stated that Ex. M-5 were the findings given by him in that enquiry and that Ex. M-6 to M-16 were produced by the Management in that enquiry. The documents Ex. M-17 to M-20 were tendered into evidence by the Management. MW-2 Shri Khazan Singh stated he left the service of the respondent in the year 1980 that the claimant had cited him as a witness in domestic enquiry. He did not appear before the enquiry office due to his illness and that he sent the leave application in the factory. Shri Uma Dutt Claimant stated that he was employed as Shaperman on 1st November, 1976 in the respondent factory and was working as Die Fitter when he was dismissed by the Management and was drawing Rs. 740 per month. He further stated that on 14th April, 1982 he received the chargesheet and that the enquiry held by Shri Satish Kumar Ahuja. He further stated that he filed a compliant copy Ex. W-1 against the Enquiry Officer and that Ex. W-2 was the

postal receipt and Ex. W-3 was the A.D. receipt. He further stated that Ex. W-4 was the copy of the reply sent to the chargesheet. He further stated that he was not given any opportunity to produce defence evidence even though his witness Shri Khazan Singh was admitted in the Hospital due to accident, while the other witness Shri Mahesh Pal had proceeded on leave. He further stated that on 8th April, 1982, he did not go inside the factory because his son was ill and he went there after 12.00 noon at the gate of the factory. He further stated that Ex. W-5 was the copy of the medical certificate and Ex. W-6 was the copy of the leave application. The letter of appointment Ex. W-7 has been proved by him.

8. The testimony of Shri Satish Kumar Ahuja MW-1 is to the effect that the enquiry was held by him in accordance with rules and that full opportunity was given to the workman to cross-examine the witness produced by the Management, who was represented by Shri Ram Avtar. Ex. M-2 is the copy of the chargesheet dated 14th April, 1982. The allegations mentioned in this document were that the claimant did not come on duty on 8th April, 1982 in the morning but he came at 12.30 afternoon and left the factory after about forty minutes without permission and further that on 14th April, 1982 he was called by the Managing Partner of the Factory through Shri K.K. Mishra to explain his position when the claimant stated that on 8th April, 1982 he was not in a mood and that he was the owner of his mood, while the Managing partner was the owner of the factory. It was further alleged that the claimant stated that he had not done anything new and will do the same in future and that the Managing Partner could do whatever he liked. Ex. M-4 contains the enquiry proceedings, which show that the claimant was represented by Shri Ram Avtar and that the Management examined Shri MW-1 Shri Surinder Pal Singh, Managing Partner of the Factory MW-2 Shri O.P. Dhinra, Partner of the factory and MW-3 Shri K.K. Mishra Foreman, who had reported the matter to the Management,—vide report Ex. M-1, Shri Minto Dev Nath MW-2 was also produced by the Management, in the enquiry proceedings. All these persons fully supported the charges made against the claimant and they were cross-examined on behalf of the claimant. This document further shows that the Management closed their evidence on 14th May, 1982 and the claimant was called upon to produce his evidence, but the enquiry was adjourned to 18th May, 1982 on his request. On 18th May, 1982 the claimant was examined when the enquiry was adjourned to 21st May, 1982 on the request of the claimant clearly stating that no further opportunity would be given to the claimant on 21st May, 1982, no witness was produced by the claimant and stated that his representative was ill. The enquiry officer closed the defence evidence holding that no medical certificate of the representative had been filed and that last opportunity was given to the claimant, but he had failed to avail of the same. The Enquiry Officer thus submitted his report on 26th May, 1982 Ex. M-5, holding that the charges levelled against the claimant stood proved. The detailed reasons are given by the Enquiry Officer in his report Ex. M-5. Show cause notice dated 5th June, 1982 Ex. M-7 was given to the claimant and thereafter the Management dismissed the claimant on 11th June, 1982,—vide letter Ex. M-20. The evidence led by the Management, therefore, shows that the charge-sheet was served on the claimant, who submitted his reply dated 16th April, 1982 Ex. M-8 when the Enquiry Officer was appointed who held the enquiry in the presence of Shri Ram Avtar representative of the workman and that the witnesses produced by the Management were cross-examined and that the claimant alone appeared in the witness box in his defence and after considering the entire evidence, the Enquiry Officer found that the charges against the claimant stood proved and ultimately the claimant was dismissed.

9. The claimant has deposed that no fair and proper enquiry was held because he was not given full opportunity to produce defence evidence. He produced the photostat copy of the leave application dated 8th April, 1982 Ex. W-6 and photostat copy of the medical certificate Ex. W-5 to the effect that his son Subhash Chand was recommended rest for four days on 7th April, 1982 by Dr. K.L. Chaudhary of Faridabad. He has deposed that he did not come for duty on 8th April, 1982 in morning due to illness of his son and that he came to the factory gate at about 12.00 noon but he could not hand over the documents Ex. W-5 and W-6 because the Foreman and the Manager were not available and he had informed Shri Khazan Singh, before the Enquiry Officer he had deposed that the Foreman and the Manager were not available in the factory and he informed Shri Khazan Singh and Shri Mahesh Pal that he had come to handover the leave application. If the Foreman and the Manager were not available, the leave application with medical certificate could be handed over in the office. The case of the Management is that the claimant worked for 40 minutes in the afternoon and left the factory without permission on the 8th April, 1982 MW-1 Shri Surinder Paul Singh stated in cross-examination before the Enquiry officer that the signatures of the claimant did not appear in the attendance sheet which was kept at the gate of the factory but he stated that the claimant did not affix his signature in that document on 8th April, 1982 because previously he did not do so several times and that the Chowkidar used to obtain his signatures later on. Consequently there is no force in the plea taken by the workman that he did not come for duty on 8th April, 1982. On the other hand, the evidence led by the Management shows that the claimant worked for 40 minutes in the afternoon on that date and left the factory without obtaining permission.

10. The workman has produced copy of the complaint Ex. W-1 sent by him on 18th May, 1982,—vide postal receipt Ex. W-2 and A.D. receipt Ex. W-3 in which it was alleged that the proceedings of the enquiry were not being recorded properly by the Enquiry Officer. This document do not help the claimant because the proceedings of the enquiry Ex. M-4 have been proved by the Enquiry Officer which are in details and show that the claimant cross-examined all the witnesses produced by the Management and that his representative Shri Avtar Singh was also present. Ex. W-4 is the copy of the reply sent to the charge-sheet by the workman. Ex. W-5

is the copy of the Appointment letter of the claimant. The appointment letter contains the terms and conditions on which the claimant was appointed on 1st November, 1971. Consequently the evidence led by the workman does not show that the enquiry was not held properly.

11. The Management produced MW-1 Shri Surinder Paul Singh, MW-2, Shri O.P. Dhingra and MW-3 Shri K.K. Mishra in the enquiry proceedings, who deposed that the claimant was called by Shri Surinder Paul Singh on 9th April, 1982 to explain his absence, dated 8th April, 1982 when the claimant stated that he was not in a mood to work on that date and that he was the owner of his own mood while Shri Surinder Paul Singh was the owner of the factory and further that the claimant told him that it was not a new thing and he would repeat the same in future. The report of the Enquiry Officer is based on the testimony of these witnesses and after considering the same, the Enquiry Officer found that these charges against the claimant stood proved. There is no cogent evidence from the workman's side to rebut this evidence.

12. It was argued by the representative of the workman that no sufficient opportunity was given to the workman by the Enquiry Officer to produce his defence evidence on 15th May, 1982 when the enquiry was adjourned to 18th May, 1982. On 18th May, 1982 the workman appeared and on his request the enquiry was adjourned to 21st May, 1982 when it was clearly mentioned that no further opportunity will be given to him. On 21st May, 1982, no witness of the workman was present and the medical certificate of his representative Shri Ram Avtar was not filed due to which Enquiry Officer closed the evidence. Consequently, the workman did not avail of three opportunities given to him in this respect and on this ground the enquiry proceedings cannot be set aside.

13. It was argued on behalf of the workman that merely because he remained absent for 1/2 day, was not ground to hold that he was guilty of misconduct. Reliance was placed on the ruling reported as Bawa Crockery House, Ltd. and R.N. Bhoomick, 1954-LLJ page 335, in which it is laid down that the absence of the workman for half a day without justification could not be regarded either a gross breach of discipline or gross negligence of duty. The following two charges were framed against the workman :—

- (1) absence from duty for half a day without permission on 18th April, 1982 and
- (2) Misbehaviour with Shri Surinder Paul Singh on 9th April, 1982.

Both the charges were proved against the workman by the Enquiry Officer in his report Ex. M-5, as discussed above. As such, it cannot be held that the workman has not committed any act of misconduct, and the this ruling is distinguishable on facts. The ruling reported as Dalmia Dabri Cement Ltd. & Shri Murari Lal Bikaneria, 1970-I-LLJ page 416, was relied upon by the Management in which the domestic enquiry was held by an Advocate, who was on certain occasions engaged by them as junior counsel and it was held that this circumstance did not render him incompetent to hold the domestic enquiry. In the present case the argument advanced from the workman side to the effect that Shri Satish Ahuja, Enquiry Officer was an employee of the management is without any force because in the above rulings it is clearly laid down that an Advocate who was engaged on certain occasions could hold the domestic enquiry. Shri Satish Ahuja advocate was not full-time employee of the Management but he was their part-time employee. The second ruling reported as Tata Oil Mills Company Ltd. and its workmen 1964-II-LLJ page 113, in which it is laid down that the reasonable opportunity to defend has to be given to the workman. As already mentioned above, the workman was given three opportunities to produce defence evidence but he failed to produce any witness. The third ruling is reported as Woodbriar and Sussex Estates and Their workers, 1960-II-LLJ page 673 in which it is laid down that there is no obligation on the Enquiry Officer to take down the evidence either in regional language or in the language known to the employee. Consequently the enquiry cannot be set aside merely because it was alleged that copies of the certain documents were not supplied to the workman in the language, which was known to him.

14. It was argued on behalf of the workman that the punishment awarded to the workman was disproportionate to the misconduct complained of and as such the workman was entitled to reinstatement as the allegations against him were of serious nature. Reliance has been placed on the ruling reported as The Management of the Federation of India Chamber of Commerce and Industry versus Their Workman R. K. Mittal, AIR-1972 Supreme Court 763, in which it is laid down that although the award of punishment for misconduct is a matter for the Management to decide and if there is justification for punishment imposed, the Tribunal should not interfere but where the punishment is so disproportionate that no reasonable employer would ever have imposed it in like circumstance, the Tribunal may treat the imposition of such punishment as itself showing victimisation or unfair labour practice. The second ruling is reported as Sri Lakshmi Saraswathi Motor Transport Co. versus Labour Court, Madras and another, Vol. XXXI, F.J.R. page 543, in which it is laid down that where the punishment awarded by the employer is shockingly disproportionate, regard being had to the particular conduct and the past record of the workman, or is such as no reasonable employer would ever impose in like circumstances the Industrial Tribunal would be justified in treating the imposition of such punishment itself as showing victimisation or unfair labour practice, entitling the Tribunal to interfere with the punishment. In the present case, the first charge against the claimant was that he absented himself for half a day without permission. It was not a serious charge because the workman has led evidence that his son was seriously ill. The second charge relating to 9th April, 1982 was to the effect that claimant has told Shri Surinder Paul Singh, Managing Partner of the factory, that he did not work on 8th April, 1982 because he was not in a mood to work and that he was owne

of his mood, while Shri Surinder Paul Singh, Managing Partner was the owner of his mood, while Shri Surinder Paul Singh, Managing Partner was the owner of the factory and further that the claimant would do so in future. As already mentioned above, the son of the claimant was seriously ill, due to which the workman was feeling upset and in that state of mind, he uttered certain words, which prove his misconduct, but the punishment awarded to the workman was disproportionate to his misconduct. Following the above rulings, the ends of justice would be met if instead of dismissing the workman, he is reinstated but be deprived of three-fourth back wages for his misconduct. In view of the above discussion, it is held that the enquiry against the workman was fair and proper, but dismissal of the workman was disproportionate to his misconduct and as such, the workman is entitled to reinstatement, but would get one-fourth back wage only. The award is passed accordingly.

Dated, the 14th September, 1984.

R. N. BATRA

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst No. 957, dated 19th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. BATRA,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 28th September, 1984.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/6517.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Mac Metal Works, Plot No. 2, Gurukul Sarai, Faridabad:—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 285 of 1982

between

SHRI AMARJEET, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S  
MAC METAL WORKS, PLOT NO. 2, GURUKUL SARAI, FARIDABAD

Present —

None for the parties.

AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, —vide his order No. ID/FD/144/82,49628, dated 3rd November, 1982, under section 10 (i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the industrial dispute existing between Shri Amarjeet, workman and the respondent-management of M/s Mac Metal Works, Plot No. 2, Gurukul Sarai, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Amarjeet was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

None is appeared on behalf of either side. The case was called many a time. It shows that the workman is not interested to pursue this reference. Hence the award is given that no dispute is pending between the parties.

Dated, the 13th August, 1984.

R. N. SINGAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1984, dated the 6th September, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. SINGAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.